

NOT PRECEDENTIAL

UNITED STATES COURT OF APPEAL
FOR THE THIRD CIRCUIT

No: 06-1522

LAURIE O'REILLY,
Appellant

v.

RUTGERS, THE STATE UNIVERSITY OF NEW JERSEY

On Appeal From The United States District Court
District of New Jersey
District Judge: Hon. Faith S. Hochberg
D.C. No. 04-cv-05787

ARGUED
April 19, 2007

Before: MCKEE, AMBRO, Circuit Judges, and MICHEL, * Chief Circuit Judge.

(Filed: April 25, 2007)

OPINION

Stephen E. Klausner, Esq. (**Argued**)
Klausner & Hunter
63 East High Street
P.O. Box 1012
Somerville, NJ 08876
Attorney for Appellant

* The Honorable Paul R. Michel, Chief Judge of the United States Court of Appeals for the Federal Circuit, sitting by designation.

Aron M. Schwartz, Esq. (**Argued**)
Greenbaum, Rowe, Smith & Davis
P.O. Box 5600
Metro Corporate Campus One
Woodbridge, NJ 07095
Attorney for Appellee

Ann E. Reesman, Esq.
McGuiness, Norris & Williams
1015 15th Street, N.W.
Suite 1200
Washington, D.C. 20005
Attorney for Amicus-appellee

OPINION OF THE COURT

McKee, Circuit Judge

Laurie O'Reilly appeals the district court's grant of summary judgment in this action that she filed under the Family Medical Leave Act. 29 U.S.C.A. § 2601 *et. seq.* We will affirm.

Since we write primarily for the parties who are familiar with this case, we need not repeat the facts or procedural history. O'Reilly claims the District Court erred in dismissing the complaint O'Reilly filed in which she claimed that Rutgers' insistence on her filing the required Health Care Provider form with a supervisor rather than with a medical professional violated both the FMLA and her right to privacy. The pertinent facts are not disputed.

In its thorough and well reasoned Opinion dated January 19, 2006, the District

Court explained why Rutgers was entitled to judgment as a matter of law based upon the undisputed facts. We can add little to that court's analysis and discussion. Accordingly, we will affirm substantially for the reasons set forth in the aforementioned Opinion of the District Court.